

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

YANIV DE RIDDER, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ROBLOX CORPORATION, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 23-cv-04146-VC

**ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT
PAUL CLISH'S MOTION TO DISMISS
SECOND AMENDED
CONSOLIDATED CLASS ACTION
COMPLAINT**

Re: Dkt. No. 235

Defendant Paul Clish's Motion to Dismiss is denied. This ruling assumes that the reader is familiar with the facts, the applicable law, and the arguments made by both parties.

The plaintiffs adequately pleaded that they gambled and lost money or property on each of the gambling websites.¹ T.D.'s allegation that he lost tens of thousands of Robux on RBXFlip, RBLXWild, Bloxflip, and Bloxmoon is enough to plead that he lost money or property on RBXFlip. Similarly, N.S.'s allegation that he paid money to several of the gambling websites is an adequate pleading that he paid money to RBXFlip. And, at the Motion to Dismiss stage, N.S.'s allegation that he "gambled tens of thousands of Robux" on the gambling websites supports an inference that he lost money or property on the websites.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 8, 2025



VINCE CHHABRIA
United States District Judge

¹ The Court does not consider Clish's arguments about L.C. because he is no longer a plaintiff in the case. Dkt. No. 252. It also does not consider Clish's arguments about the parents because the plaintiffs have dropped the parents' claims. Dkt. No. 231.